



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,160	04/14/2004	Paul E. Carpenter	NTR-001	8171
26868 7590 02/11/2008 HASSE & NESBITT LLC 8837 CHAPEL SQUARE DRIVE SUITE C CINCINNATI, OH 45249				
EXAMINER ALLEN, WILLIAM J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,160

Applicant(s)

CARPENTER ET AL.

Examiner

WILLIAM J. ALLEN

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History Summary

Claims 1-26 are pending and rejected as set forth below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In addition, the Examiner notes the following:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, **one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.** See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Examiner strongly asserts that when taken in combination, the combination does indeed teach the recited elements of the claimed features.

Furthermore, Applicant attempts to argue on Page 9 (second paragraph) and Page 11 (second paragraph) that Silva fails to teach where a customer creates a bundle of items for purchase. This statement is in err, as Page 4 of the action mailed 9/4/2007 clearly states that Henson teaches this feature [see: "*d. allowing the consumer to create and purchase at retail a virtual bundle of items from those items available for inclusion within the virtual bundle (see at least: Fig. 1-10, abstract, col. 4 lines 36-52)*"; The Examiner notes that the customized computer system is a bundle"].

It is also of important note that Henson indeed teaches a product bundle, not just computer parts bundles together physically as contested by Applicant. For example, Henson

includes not only internal parts of the computer bundle such as hard drives, network cards, modems, and the like, but also includes external devices not physically bundled in the computer system (such as a mouse, keyboard, printer, scanner, surge protector, etc.) (see at least: Fig. 3A-3B).

Lastly, Applicant's remarks regarding Silva on pages 10-11 are simply false. As noted in the prior action on pages 5-6, Silva teaches where an affiliate site acts as a referring site for the associate merchant site (i.e. first and second vendors respectively). When a transaction, such as purchasing of a bundle at the merchant site (i.e. the second vendor), is completed the merchant site pays a percentage of the purchase made to the affiliate site (i.e. first vendor), and thereby provides a financial incentive.

In summary, it is hereby asserted in accordance with the rejection below that the combination of references cited teaches the invention as claimed. Any new grounds of rejection has been necessitated by Applicant's amendment to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 15, 20, and 26 recite the newly amended feature of where the purchase “is not an on-line purchase via the internet”. Applicant’s specification, however, lacks support for such feature. For example, paragraph 10 on page 3 recites where the purchase is performed in a physical establishment and is “distinguished from an on-line purchase via the internet”. To the same accord, paragraph 20 on page 7 shows where the server housing purchase information is connected to the Internet and accessible to vendors for retrieval of the purchase information. Applicant’s specification, thereby, lacks support for a purchase that is not effected by the Internet. From paragraph 20 it becomes apparent that at least some portion of the purchase is made online via the Internet.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claims 1, 15, 20, and 26 recite the newly amended feature of where the purchase “is not an on-line purchase via the internet”, which render the claims indefinite. More specifically, Applicant’s specification merely states that the purchase is performed in a physical establishment and is “distinguished from an on-line purchase via the internet” (see Paragraph 10). It is not clear, from the claims or specification, of what constitutes “not an on-line purchase via the Internet”. Applicant’s own specification shows that a computer server is used to house information and accessed by vendors through the Internet (see Paragraph 20). It is simply not clear as to the level of which a purchase is no longer considered an online purchase via the Internet, and is thereby considered “distinguished”, when Applicant’s own specification shows the use of an internet accessible server for use in completing purchases made by customers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 20-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (6,167,383) in view of Silva et al. (US 2001/0034658) in further view of Kjallstrom (US 20020010655).

Regarding claim 1, Henson teaches:

a. providing information from a first vendor to a second vendor about items available from the first vendor that are available for inclusion within items offered by the second vendor to a consumer for purchase at retail as a virtual bundle of items (see at least: Fig. 3A-5); The Examiner notes that products from vendors such as Intel, Iomega, Microsoft, Harman/Kardon, APC, HP, and the like are bundled with products such as computer towers and monitors from Dell (first and second vendors respectively);

c. communicating an offer by the second vendor to a consumer for the purchase at retail of a virtual bundle of items from those items available for inclusion within the virtual bundle (see at least: Fig. 6-10, abstract, col. 4 lines 36-52);

d. allowing the consumer to create and purchase at retail a virtual bundle of items from those items available for inclusion within the virtual bundle (see at least: Fig. 1-10, abstract, col. 4 lines 36-52); The Examiner notes that the customized computer system is a bundle.

Henson teaches all of the above as noted and further teaches a customization web site featuring products from outside manufacturers (see at least: Fig. 1-5). Henson, however, does not expressly teach *b. providing information from the first vendor to the second vendor about an incentive offered by the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer; e. providing information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer to the first vendor and the second vendor; and f. providing an incentive from the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer*. Silva teaches a system for selling bundles of multiple items through the use of electronic shopping lists (see at least: abstract). Silva further teaches:

b. providing information from the first vendor to the second vendor about an incentive offered by the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer (see at least: abstract, 0003-0004, 0006);

e. providing information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer to the first vendor and the second vendor (see at least: abstract, 0003-0004, 0017, 0025-0026); and

f. providing an incentive from the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer (see at least: abstract, 0003-0004, 0006). The

Examiner notes that an affiliate site acts as a referring site for the associate merchant site (i.e. first and second vendors). When a transaction, such as purchasing of a bundle, is completed the merchant site pays a percentage of the purchase made to the affiliate site, and thereby provides a

financial incentive. Additionally, since that percentage is based on the transaction (i.e. purchased bundle), it thereby constitutes information about the transaction (i.e. virtual bundle purchased) and information about the incentive offered to the affiliate site by the merchant site.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson to have included *b. providing information from the first vendor to the second vendor about an incentive offered by the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer; e. providing information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer to the first vendor and the second vendor; and f. providing an incentive from the first vendor to the second vendor based on the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer* as taught by Silva in order to provide merchandising that is financially beneficial to the of both the merchant and an affiliate of the merchant (i.e. first and second vendors) by providing an external source of potential customers who are already viewing material directly related to the merchant and an additional source of income to an affiliate of the merchant (see at least: Silva, 0003).

Additionally, though Henson teaches all of the above, Henson does not expressly teach where a consumer creates and purchases the virtual bundle *at a physical retail or wherein the purchase by the consumer of the items in the virtual bundle occurs in the physical retail establishment and is not an on-line purchase via the Internet*. In the same field of endeavor, Kjallstrom teaches an interactive interface for displaying products in real-time (see at least: abstract). More specifically, Kjallstrom utilizes an in-store terminal that allows users to both single products or

collections of products (i.e. bundle) (see at least: 0029). Once products have been selected, the user can *either* place their product order through an online procurement system, accept as-is the quoted price and delivery, save their product selections and email it to a sales associate at a local physical retail operation to enter into negotiation, or if the user is viewing the information at an in-store computer terminal, place the product order directly with the sales associate(s) at the store (i.e. effect the purchase not online via the Internet) (see at least: 0031). Thereby, Kjallstrom teaches *wherein the purchase by the consumer of the items in the virtual bundle occurs in the physical retail establishment and is not an on-line purchase via the Internet* (see at least: 0029 (note “stand alone system”), 0031 (note: “combination of products” - i.e. bundle), 0034 (note “free standing display” and “in-store terminal”)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson to have included where a consumer creates and purchases the virtual bundle *at a physical retail and wherein the purchase by the consumer of the items in the virtual bundle occurs in the physical retail establishment and is not an on-line purchase via the Internet* as taught by Kjallstrom in order to provide the customer with the ability to examine products and product features in such a way as to accelerate the decision making process by reducing uncertainty (see at least: Kjallstrom, 0034). Further, the Examiner also asserts that incorporation of such features is no more than the combination of known prior art elements according to their established function yielding predictable results.

Regarding claims 2-5 and 7-8, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches:

(2) *wherein the first vendor is the manufacturer of the items available for inclusion within the virtual bundle of items* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5).

(3) *wherein the second vendor is a customer of the manufacturer* (see at least: abstract, Fig. 3A-5).

(4) wherein the items are identified by a unique identification code (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5). The Examiner notes the use of product identifiers unique to each products as ‘unique identification codes’.

(5) *wherein the items are products, services, or combinations thereof* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5).

(7) *wherein the consumer is given an incentive for purchasing the virtual bundle of items* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5). The Examiner notes that each component/product provides a description for purchasing that component/product with the bundle (e.g. a larger hard drive provides more storage). Incentive is also provided to purchase a certain system (e.g. the XPS R is built with “performance and reliability in mind”). Furthermore, the ability to lease a bundle provides a financial incentive to the consumer to purchase the bundle.

(8) wherein the second vendor receives a financial incentive each time a consumer purchases a virtual bundle of items in a single market basket transaction (see at least: Henson, col. 4 lines 36-52, col. 6 lines 39-43, col. 7 lines 39-48, col. 10 lines 7-18). The Examiner notes that by selling the bundled system, and further by providing items to be added on, the selling vendor receives a financial incentive by receiving revenue from the sale of the configured

system/bundled items. Additionally, add-ons increase the revenue and provide an additional financial incentive to bundle additional items.

Regarding claim 9, Henson teaches all of the above as noted but does not expressly teach *wherein information about the items available from the first vendor for inclusion in a virtual bundle is posted on a server*. Silva teaches *wherein information about the items available from the first vendor for inclusion in a virtual bundle is posted on a server* (see at least: Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson to have included *wherein information about the items available from the first vendor for inclusion in a virtual bundle is posted on a server* as taught by Silva in order to provide merchandising that is financially beneficial to the of both the merchant and an affiliate of the merchant (i.e. first and second vendors) by providing an external source of potential customers who are already viewing material directly related to the merchant and an additional source of income to an affiliate of the merchant (see at least: Silva, 0003).

Regarding claims 20 and 26, these claims closely parallel the limitations of claim 1. Claims 20 and 26 are thereby rejected for at least the rationale regarding the claim 1 and its dependents rejected above.

Regarding claims 21-22, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches:

(21) *an interface circuit configured to establish a connection with a remote computer system* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 1-10).

(22) *wherein the means for posting information is included within a server on which information about the available items is stored* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 1-2; Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4).

4. Claims 10-14 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom, as applied to claims 1-5, 7-9, 20-22, and 26 above, and further in view of Andrews (6,285,986).

Regarding claim 10, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches all of the above as noted and further teaches *wherein information about the items available from the first vendor for inclusion in a virtual bundle is posted on a server* (see at least: Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4). Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom, however, does not expressly teach establishing an internet connection with the server *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items*. Andrews teaches an internet connection *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items* (see at least: abstract, Fig. 3-5a, col. 5 lines 1-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom to have included *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items* as taught by Andrews in order to provide a system for automated registration, negotiation, and marketing for combining products and services from one or more vendors together to be sold as a unit to automate the promotion and sale of product groups/bundles (see at least: Andrews, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-29).

Regarding claims 11-13, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom further teaches:

(11) *wherein the second vendor receives a financial incentive each time a consumer purchases a virtual bundle of items in a single market basket transaction* (see at least: Henson, col. 4 lines 36-52, col. 10 lines 7-18). The Examiner notes that the selling vendor receives the incentive as in claim 8 for each purchase made.

(12) *wherein information about the market basket transaction is collected, stored and transferred for processing and validation* (see at least: Henson, col. 4 line 66-col. 5 line 5, col. 6 lines 31-38 and 44-67, col. 7 lines 36-48).

(13) *wherein the information is processed on a server* (see at least: Henson, Fig. Fig. 1-2; Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4).

Regarding claim 14, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches all of the above as noted but does not expressly teach *wherein reports comprising information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer are generated and provided to the first vendor and the second vendor*. Andrews teaches *wherein reports comprising information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer are generated and provided to the first vendor and the second vendor* (see at least: Fig. 1, 8, abstract, col. 6 lines 35-36, col. 12 line 8-col. 13 line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom to have included *wherein the information is processed on a server and wherein reports comprising information about the virtual bundle of items purchased by the consumer are*

generated and provided to the first vendor and the second vendor as taught by Andrews in order to provide a system for automated registration, negotiation, and marketing for combining products and services from one or more vendors together to be sold as a unit to automate the promotion and sale of product groups/bundles (see at least: Andrews, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-29).

Regarding claims 23-24, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches all of the above and further teaches *providing information from a first vendor to a second vendor about items available from the first vendor that are available for inclusion within items offered by the second vendor to a consumer for purchase at retail as a virtual bundle of items* (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5; Silva, 0025-0026). Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom, however, does not expressly teach *wherein a connection is established to view, select and accept information about the offer from the first vendor where only registered with the server as authorized users are allowed to view, select and accept information*. Andrews teaches *wherein a connection is established to view, select and accept information about the offer from the first vendor where only registered with the server as authorized users are allowed to view, select and accept information* (see at least: abstract, col. 3 lines 32-40, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom to have included *wherein a connection is established to view, select and accept information about the offer from the first vendor where only registered with the server as authorized users are allowed to view, select and accept information* as taught by Andrews in order to provide a system for automated registration,

negotiation, and marketing for combining products and services from one or more vendors together to be sold as a unit to automate the promotion and sale of product groups/bundles (see at least: Andrews, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 25, Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom teaches all of the above and further teaches providing information from a first vendor to a second vendor about items available from the first vendor that are available for inclusion within items offered by the second vendor to a consumer for purchase at retail as a virtual bundle of items (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5; Silva, 0025-0026). Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom, however, does not expressly teach wherein the server and at least one remote computer system are coupled together over the Internet to allow the user of the remote system to view, select and accept information relating to the offer. Andrews teaches wherein the server and at least one remote computer system are coupled together over the Internet to allow the user of the remote system to view, select and accept information relating to the offer (see at least: abstract, col. 3 lines 32-40, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in further view of Kjallstrom to have included wherein the server and at least one remote computer system are coupled together over the Internet to allow the user of the remote system to view, select and accept information relating to the offer as taught by Andrews in order to provide automate promotion and sale by combining products from multiple vendors to be sold as a group/bundle (see at least: Andrews, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-29).

5. Claims 6 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom, and in further view of PTO 892 U.

Regarding claim 6, Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom teaches all of the above as noted but does explicitly teach *wherein the offer by the second vendor to the consumer is communicated through in-store advertising*. In the same field of endeavor, and particularly regarding in-store kiosks, PTO 892 U teaches *wherein the offer by the second vendor to the consumer is communicated through in-store advertising* (see at least: PTO 892 U, Paragraphs 1-3, 5, and 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom to have included the noted features as taught by PTO 892 U because the incorporation of such features is no more than the combination of known prior art elements according to their established function yielding predictable results.

Regarding claim 15, independent claim 15 closely parallels claim 1 and further includes the elements of claims 6 and 7. Claim 15 is thereby rejected for at least the reasons regarding of claims 1, 6, and 7.

Regarding claims 16 -18, Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom in view of PTO 892 U teaches:

(16) wherein the first vendor is the manufacturer of the items available for inclusion in the virtual bundle of items (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5).

(17) wherein the second vendor and the consumer receive a financial incentive each time the consumer purchases a virtual bundle of items in a single market basket transaction (see at least: Henson, Fig. 3A-5, col. 4 lines 36-52, col. 6 lines 39-43, col. 7 lines 39-48, col. 10 lines 7-18). The Examiner notes that leasing options are a financial incentive.

(18) wherein information about the virtual bundle of items is posted on a server (see at least: Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4).

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom in view of PTO 892 U, as applied to claims 15-18 above, and further in view of Andrews (6,285,986).

Regarding claim 19, Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom in view of PTO 892 U teaches all of the above as noted and further teach *wherein information about the items available from the first vendor for inclusion in a virtual bundle is posted on a server* (see at least: Silva, 0025-0026, Fig. 1 and 4). Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom in view of PTO 892 U, however, does not expressly teach establishing an internet connection with the server *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items*. Andrews teaches an internet connection *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items* (see at least: abstract, Fig. 3-5a, col. 5 lines 1-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Henson in view of Silva in view of Kjallstrom in view of PTO 892 U to have included *for the second vendor to view and select the items available for inclusion within the items offered to a consumer for purchase as a virtual bundle of items* as taught by Andrews in order to provide a system for automated registration, negotiation, and marketing for combining products and services from one or more vendors together to be sold as a unit to automate the promotion and sale of product groups/bundles (see at least: Andrews, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-29).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM J. ALLEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1443. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William J Allen/
Examiner, Art Unit 3625

/Matthew S Gart/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625